



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/909,898	07/23/2001	Yoshio Sugaya	211758US0	9196

22850 7590 03/05/2003

OBLON, SPIVAK, MCCLELLAND, MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.
1940 DUKE STREET
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314

EXAMINER

ZITOMER, FRED

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1713

DATE MAILED: 03/05/2003

13

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office
ADDRESS:
ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTY. DOCKET NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	------------------


[]	EXAMINER	
L	J	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER

DATE MAILED:

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning the above identified application.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Attached is a copy of the telephone Interview Summary of February 24, 2003.


FRED. ZITOMER, PhD
PRIMARY EXAMINER
ART UNIT 1713

Zitomer/fz
February 24, 2003

Attachment: Form PTOL-413.

Interview Summary

Application No.
09/909,898

Applicant(s)
Sugaya et al.

Examiner
Fred Zitomer

Art Unit
1713



All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Fred Zitomer

(3) _____

(2) Samuel H. Blech

(4) _____

Date of Interview Feb 24, 2003

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☐ Personal [copy is given to 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No. If yes, brief description:

Claim(s) discussed: None

Identification of prior art discussed:
Of record.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☒ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:

Applicant requested clarification of what is meant by "meaningful head-to-head comparison" as stated in the prior Office action. Applicant was advised that such comparison requires directly comparing the preparation of two membranes of the same composition, one prepared as claimed herein, the other differing only in that the monomer is polymerized before mixing with the binder. It is important to note that even if criticality is thus shown obviousness in view of MacDonald must be demonstrated.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

i) ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview (if box is checked).

Unless the paragraph above has been checked, THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required